



31761 065573420

**BRIEF**

11 BV

0055893





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2010 with funding from  
University of Toronto



ESSAY  
ON  
THE EXTENT  
OF THE  
DEATH OF CHRIST,  
FROM THE  
TREATISE ON THE DIVINE WILL,  
BY EDWARD POLHILL, ESQ.

---

WITH A PREFACE.

---

BERWICK:  
PUBLISHED BY THOMAS MELROSE.

---

MDCCCXLII.

162

## P R E F A C E.

---

IT has been justly remarked, that “there are three questions respecting what has been termed the extent of the death of Christ, all of them of deep interest, though not of equal importance. Some hold that Christ died for all men, *so as to secure their salvation* ;—this is a question between the Universalists and the great body of Christians, whether Calvinists or Arminians. Some hold that he died for all men, *so as to procure for them easier terms of acceptance, and sufficient divine aid to enable them to avail themselves of these terms* ;—this is a question between Arminians ‘(or rather perhaps between those Arminians who verge towards Pelagianism)’ and Calvinists. Some hold that not only did Christ die with the intention of saving the elect, but that he died for all men, *so as to remove all the obstacles in the way of man’s salvation, except those which arise out of his own indisposition to receive it* ;—this is a question *among Calvinists*,\* a question belonging to

\* See Dr. Brown’s Opinions on Faith, &c. p. 68.

that category of controversies sometimes designated “controversies among the orthodox.”

It is well known that the last of these questions has recently attracted a considerable portion of attention in Scotland, particularly among the ministers and members of the United Secession. That there should not prevail among them a perfect identity of sentiment and speech on this topic, will seem less surprising, if it is considered that their subordinate standards leave room for some slight diversity. The Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, if they do not explicitly inculcate, seem evidently to countenance the doctrine of a limited atonement, the doctrine that the Saviour died solely and exclusively for the elect.\* But the Testimony last emitted, like some former official documents, teaches, that so far as the requisitions of law and justice are concerned, he has removed all obstacles to the salvation of all; a principle which lies at the basis of the preaching probably of every evangelical minister in Scotland.

There can be little doubt that in the Secession, and indeed in almost every other christian community, the present tendency of opinion is towards that view of the Saviour’s sacrifice, which regards it as having a general or extended reference, as wearing a benignant aspect to the race at large. Many who, a few years ago, would have been shocked at the assertion that Christ died for any besides the elect, will now admit that in some sense he died for all. Even of those, however, who concede this, the greater proportion repudiate the expression, if not the notion, of a universal atonement: while there are still many who maintain confidently that the Saviour suffered and made atonement only for a limited and definite number.

There is reason to think that the prejudice against

\* Confession viii. 5.

the doctrine of what is called a universal atonement originates in misapprehensions respecting it ; misapprehensions engendered in part by the errors and extravagancies which have been blended with it by some of its professed friends. It would therefore be a service eminently seasonable, and of no small value, to furnish a distinct statement of the doctrine, and to separate it from the doubtful speculations and mistaken opinions which have been engrafted upon it. Such a statement, it is apprehended, will be found in the following Essay, extracted from an old and valuable treatise, which unhappily is now comparatively little known. The fragment here reprinted divides itself into two parts. The first is occupied in proving that "Christ died for all men ;" the second in proving that "he did not die for all equally ; that, while his death secures infallibly the salvation of the elect, it merely places the rest of mankind in what is called a *salvable state*—a state in which they may be saved on gospel terms."

Such is a summary of the doctrine advanced in the following pages relative to the design and extent of Christ's death. And such in substance is the doctrine of general redemption, or atonement, as maintained by Bp. Davenant, by Truman, by Richard Baxter, and by various other authors of the seventeenth century. This seems to be nearly, if not identically, the doctrine which the Marrow divines were seeking, "if haply they might feel after it and find it," when they spake of the "universal deed of gift and grant of the Saviour," and represented saving faith as consisting in "a person believing that Christ died for him in particular." It seems probable also, that of this doctrine Ebenezer Erskine, the venerable father of the Secession, had not indeed a distinct apprehension but a dim glimpse, not a firm faith but a faint belief, when he asserted that "all mankind, and especially gospel hearers, have such an interest in Christ's death as warrants [each of] them to say in

faith, "He loved me, and gave himself for me." It is probable too that some such doctrine as this was the mark at which our forefathers of the Secession aimed, when they declared that "the Lord Jesus Christ, in the glorious constitution of his person as God-man, doth stand in an equal or undistinguished relation of a Kinsman-Redeemer to mankind-sinners as such; and that the atonement and righteousness of Christ are in themselves of a justice-satisfying and law-magnifying nature, containing the utmost of what law and justice can require for repairing the whole breach of the covenant of works, and fulfilling the same, in order to the justification of mankind-sinners as such." In thus expressing themselves they evidently overshot the mark; and, as if destined to furnish an instructive proof of human fallibility, countenanced an Arminian dogma in their very "Act against Arminian errors."

The statement of the doctrine of a general atonement given in the following extracts may not be absolutely faultless; but a statement of it less exceptionable could not easily be selected. Assuming what, it is apprehended, the Author has abundantly proved, that his doctrine, at least in all its essential peculiarities, is accordant with Scripture, that doctrine suggests various important remarks and inferences, some of which it may not be improper to specify.

First, then, from the statement here given it follows, that the doctrine that Christ died, or made atonement for all men, ought not to be identified or associated with any particular theory respecting the order of the divine purposes. Some of the recent advocates of this doctrine have most injudiciously encumbered it with extraneous difficulties, by incorporating with it tenets exceedingly questionable, if not positively erroneous. In particular, they have connected with it the tenet, that while the purpose of atonement and that of election are simultaneous,

having each existed in the Divine mind from eternity, the former is to be conceived of as prior in what is called the order of nature. This is an assertion which, even if true, is somewhat “hard to be understood.” The atonement is a means for the accomplishment of an end; and the ends which it was to accomplish were twofold; one respecting mankind generally, another relating to a select and limited number. In human schemes the idea of the end precedes that of the means; and therefore it may reasonably be presumed that what the abettors of the assertion in question intend to affirm is this, that the first of the ends just mentioned is to be conceived of as in the order of nature prior to the other; not surely that the atonement was resolved on irrespectively of its objects and results. Even in this modified view, the tenet is liable to great, if not to insurmountable objections. It seems to be at variance with several statements of Scripture, and it relates to a subject which is almost altogether above the sphere of the human faculties, namely, the mode of the operations of the Infinite mind. If it is not to be classed with those questions of which Bishop Butler says that “there is a great impropriety even in asking them,” and that “they have been rashly determined, and perhaps with equal rashness contrary ways,” it is at least a subject on which no man of wisdom and humility will permit himself to dogmatize.

But whether this tenet be true or false, and whether it be within or beyond the range of our knowledge, it must not be considered either as an integral part, or a necessary concomitant of the doctrine of a general atonement. It is scarcely, if at all mentioned in the following Essay; an omission the more remarkable that the Essay is extracted from a treatise on the very subject of the Divine decrees. Bishop Davenant, who has written at great length, and with great learning and ability, in defence both of a general and special reference in the death of Christ, ad-

verts to this question, but for what purpose? Simply that he may decline the discussion of it; and accordingly he characterises it as “a thorny question, which has been tossed about by many, and which has vexed all who have undertaken to discuss it.” And we shall do well to imitate the caution and modesty of this excellent writer; lest, in attempting to penetrate the *arcana* of the Supreme Ruler, we transgress the salutary maxim of the son of Sirach, “Seek not after that which is too hard for thee: and search not into the things that are above thy strength.”

It may just be added, that even if it could be demonstrated, (which probably it cannot,) that an atonement intended both for general and special purposes, implies necessarily some sort of priority in the former, we should not be authorised to attribute this opinion to any except those by whom it is explicitly avowed. “If,” says Mr. Fuller, “if a principle be proposed to us for acceptance, it is right to weigh the consequences; but, when forming our judgment of the person who holds it, we should attach nothing to him but what he perceives and avows.”

Assuming the general correctness of the representation given in the following pages, of the designs and results of the death of Christ, it leads us to remark, in the next place, that in this controversy, as in almost every other, there are perilous extremes on both sides, into which the disputants have been betrayed. By some it is asserted that Christ died and made atonement for the elect solely, and in no sense whatever for the rest of mankind. But, not to mention other decisive objections to this opinion, it may be sufficient to remark, that if it be well-founded, the death of Christ can not constitute an adequate basis for the universal overtures of the gospel; and multitudes are invited to the “feast of fat things” for whom that feast was never intended.

On the other hand, it has been maintained that

he died alike for all ; and that his atonement was intended in precisely the same sense for Judas as for Peter, or James, or John. In vindication of this language it may perhaps be alleged, that an atonement, viewed in itself, is just a satisfaction, something in virtue of which pardon and other blessings may be dispensed in consistency with the claims of law and justice. But if the death of Christ has removed all legal obstacles to the salvation of all, it must be an atonement, and a complete atonement for all ; and to speak of it as being only a partial and imperfect atonement for any, would be most derogatory to its character. In vindication of the language under consideration it might be farther alleged, that the sacrifice of Christ does not of itself remove internal as well as external and legal obstructions ; that it does not of itself confer, nor was it ever intended that of itself, and apart from other causes, it should confer pardon, sanctification, and life eternal ; and that if it did, it would supersede entirely the work of the Spirit, and all the other operations of Christ himself.

In reply to this reasoning it may be admitted, that in one sense, and that perhaps the most strict and proper sense, a sense sanctioned not only by the practice of orthodox writers, but by Scripture, the death of Christ is a true and perfect satisfaction or atonement for all. It accomplishes on behalf of all the grand and essential objects of an atonement ; rendering it consistent with the Divine character and government to grant to all pardon, and every other blessing. In this view, it is a true and perfect satisfaction for mankind-sinners as such. Indeed the very notion of an imperfect satisfaction involves an incongruity and a contradiction ; and hence it follows that for every man for whom the death of the Saviour was an atonement at all, it was a true and complete atonement.

But it must be remarked farther, that while the

sacrifice of Christ may be contemplated simply in itself, that is, as a satisfaction to justice, and as the means or basis of pardon, there is another aspect in which it must be viewed. It must be contemplated not only in connexion with the Divine appointment ordaining it, and without which it could not have been an atonement for any man, but with the Divine purposes and arrangements regarding it. It must be contemplated, in short, in connexion with all the results which it was intended to effect or ensure, whether by its direct or its indirect, its exclusive or combined operation. When the subject is thus viewed, it would obviously be most unwarrantable to assert that the Saviour died alike for all; or that his death, while it was a true and proper atonement for all, was intended for all in precisely the same sense. To the elect it secures, and was intended to secure, the communication of all saving blessings; the rest of the race it merely puts into a salvable state, bringing salvation within their reach. To affirm, then, that the Son of God died equally for Judas and Nero as for Peter and Paul, is to use language which, if true in a certain sense, is absolutely false in the sense in which it is most likely to be understood; language which is not only not sanctioned, but which is discountenanced by the general current of Scripture phraseology, and which is much more likely to offend good taste, and outrage pious feeling, than to instruct ignorance or remove prejudice.

These remarks pave the way for another observation of no small importance, and that is, that there is good ground for apprehending that various questions at present agitated respecting the extent of the atonement are little better than "strifes of words," injudicious, if not "perverse disputings of men," who, though not wholly "ignorant of the truth," do not discern it clearly and fully. Indeed it may well seem strange that on this subject there should be any controversy among moderate Calvinists. They all ad-

mit, on the one hand, the doctrines of sovereign election and special grace ; and from these doctrines it follows, as an obvious corollary, that in the eternal appointment and the actual accomplishment of the atonement, the Father and the Son must have contemplated the elect with special views and sentiments, with a peculiar love. On the other hand, they admit not less explicitly the sincerity and universality of the gospel offer ; and they admit, farther, that that offer is based entirely on the Saviour's sacrifice ; and, from these admissions, it follows plainly that his sacrifice must, in some sense, have been offered for all. Is it not, then, but reasonable to suppose, that when it is asserted by one class of these theologians, that the atonement was intended for "mankind-sinners as such," and that it was "made equally for all," the term atonement is used in its most restricted acceptation, as denoting merely that which satisfies divine justice, which removes legal obstacles, which renders it consistent with divine honour to dispense pardon ? And when it is asserted by the other class that the atonement ensures infallibly the eternal salvation of the elect, is it not equally evident that the atonement is contemplated not in its peculiar or exclusive functions, but in connexion with the decree of election, and as the fulfilment of the stipulations of the eternal covenant, the fulfilment of which secures pardon, and every other blessing, not to all, but to a limited and definite number ? These suppositions require no great stretch of charity ; indeed not to admit them demands a considerable portion of perversity or uncharitableness. But if these suppositions are admitted, it follows that the parties referred to are fighting in the dark ; that they contradict each other chiefly because the former view the atonement simply in itself, the latter view it in connexion with other arrangements ; and of course that the controversy betwixt them is little better

than a mischievous logomachy. “ How is it that we do not understand ?”

If there be any truth in the preceding observations, they inculcate most forcibly the propriety of reconsidering the subject without passion or prejudice ; and they inculcate farther the propriety of mutual forbearance. To those who allow that the offer of salvation is founded only on the sacrifice of Christ, and that this offer is universal, but who recoil with terror from the idea of a universal atonement, it might not unfitly be said, Why object to the name, when you virtually admit the thing ? “ You are terrified and affrighted, and suppose that you see a spirit. But why are ye troubled ? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts ? ” Examine the features, and listen to the voice of the object of your dread ; and you will recognise the looks and tones of one whose presence will fill you with wonder and joy. “ Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself ; handle me, and see ; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.”

On the other hand, let those who maintain formally and explicitly, that Christ died for all men, “ suffer the word of exhortation.” To object to the phrase, a universal atonement, for which you cherish so strong a predilection, may seem as unreasonable as to object to the parallel expressions, “ a ransom for all,” and “ a propitiation for the sins of the whole world.” But while you vindicate your liberty, “ take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak.” Recollect that though it would be most preposterous and iniquitous to “ make a man an offender for a word,” yet if a man employ on almost every subject an ambiguous and offensive phraseology, a phraseology which, though susceptible of a scriptural sense, will almost certainly convey an unscriptural impression : and if, “ after a first and second admonition,” he refuse to be corrected, he ought to be “ rejected.”

He is “a heretic” in the scriptural, if not the popular sense of the term ; he “causes divisions and offences ;” in the indulgence of his own senseless pride, he manifests an utter disregard for the spiritual comfort and edification of others ; and he deserves suspension, not perhaps for his ignorance or his errors, but for his incapacity to teach, for his incorrigible folly, vanity, and self-conceit.

A cautious and prudent, if not a reserved and sparing use of the expression more particularly referred to, may the more reasonably be required from those who prefer it, when it is considered that in all probability the time is not distant when the employment of it will give no offence whatever. Twelve years ago, the supreme court of the United Secession church passed an Act condemning the doctrine of a universal atonement, and forbidding the use of the phrase. But how great the change effected within the last two years. The doctrine of a general reference in the death of Christ has been officially recognised,—such a reference as necessarily implies a universal atonement, for surely nothing but a universal atonement could have opened the door of mercy for all, unless God can pardon sin without a satisfaction. And though the expression is not yet stamped by the seal of judicial approbation, the chief lets to the use of it are taken out of the way ; and already it is sanctioned by such authority as will speedily ensure its all but universal adoption. In such circumstances, the individuals more immediately addressed in the preceding observations need much more to be warned against impatience and precipitation than to be stimulated to boldness and activity.

These advices may perhaps be deemed impertinent and presumptuous ; they are tendered, however, not only without any pretension to superiority, but with all due deference and respect. At the risk of giving offence, an additional observation of an admonitory character may be hazarded. Let all the teachers

and rulers of the church remember, that while they are required to contend earnestly for the truth on every subject in religion, they cannot perform this duty aright unless they know clearly what the truth is; and unless they know farther, and know accurately, the sentiments of those with whom they contend. Let them recollect too, that they are to "assert the truth in love;" and that they must take special care not to invade the prerogative of the great Head of the church, by adding to the terms of ministerial or christian fellowship prescribed in his word. "Receive ye one another, as Christ also received us, to the glory of God."

The treatise reprinted in the following pages will serve to corroborate and reinforce both the doctrinal conclusions and the practical lessons now suggested. In combination with other kindred causes, it will perhaps contribute, not to produce a radical change of sentiment respecting the extent of the atonement, but to facilitate the transition of our language and ideas on this subject from a state of comparative confusion and contradiction, to a state of clearness and consistency. By the Divine blessing it may serve also to restrain those who are in danger of running too far; and thus it may accelerate the general adoption of that view of the subject towards which many intelligent and devout spirits are visibly tending; in which, it may be hoped, they will find rest; and in which, it may be farther hoped, our "churches will have rest, and be edified, and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, will be multiplied." Judging from present appearances, it may be confidently anticipated that some who now differ will "soon speak the same thing, will be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment;" and that, "with one mind and one mouth they will glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." This is doubtless "a consummation devoutly to be wished;"

but should this consummation fail to be realized, there is another result scarcely less desirable, which may surely be expected, and that is, the toleration, the explicit toleration of a slight diversity of expression, on a point respecting which the two parties, if they understand the other principles which they mutually avow, cannot differ widely in sentiment, if they differ at all.

In addition to what has already been stated, it may be proper to mention, that Edward Polhill, the Author of the Essay here reprinted, was a layman, a Justice of peace for the county of Sussex, in the period of the Commonwealth, or soon after the Restoration. His treatise on the “Divine Will,” &c., from which the following pages are extracted, seems to have been first published in 1673; and it is recommended in strong terms, though with a slight exception, by one whose recommendation will have, as it deserves to have, great weight, and who has been characterised as “the prince of theologians.” “The modesty,” says Dr. Owen, “wherewith he dissents from others, or opposes their sentiments, without severe reflections on persons or opinions, is also another thing which deserves both commendation and imitation; and the consideration thereof gives me the confidence in these few lines, designed unto another end, to express my own dissent from some of his apprehensions, especially about the object and extent of redemption. Had I seen this discourse before it was wholly printed, I should have communicated to the author my thoughts upon that subject, and upon some few other passages in it; but where there is an agreement in the substance and design of any doctrine, as there is between my judgment and what is here solidly declared, it is our duty to bear with each other in things circumstantial, or different explanations of the same truth, when there is no incursion made upon the main principles we own.” In terms not less laudatory, and much more striking,

are the work and its author commended by Dr. Lazarus Seaman, who was a member of the Westminster Assembly, and not likely to countenance any doctrine regarded as grossly heretical by that venerable convocation. “I have had a knowledge of him,” says Dr. S., “from his childhood, and have been certified of his domestical piety and exemplariness in all which appertains to the practice of piety. Concerning the book, it needs not patron or advocate; let it speak for itself. ‘Ætatem habet.’ It is of age. It quickly shews ‘arma virumque,’ the spirit of the man and his weapons. This pleases me above all the rest, that though it treats of most intricate and mysterious controversies, yet that is done humbly, reverently, freely, and with candour.”

Perhaps it may not be unnecessary to repeat, that it is not for a moment intended to insinuate that the following performance is free from faults or imperfections. Some of its expressions and statements are certainly unguarded; and some of its reasonings are inconclusive. On the whole, however, it contains an admirable discussion of a question which is not unimportant in itself, and which is intimately connected with some of the most vital portions of sacred truth. While this discussion is conducted with great clearness and ability, it is conducted also in a tone and spirit eminently christian, with distinguished piety, humility, and charity. In addition to its cardinal and substantial excellencies, the following Essay possesses “a double portion” of those attractions, which, though only of inferior, are yet not of little value. The composition, notwithstanding its antiquated cast, is singularly beautiful; being embellished with a profusion of graceful and striking images, and of most felicitous Scripture allusions. It may therefore be hoped that this republication, while it will serve its more immediate object of throwing light on a much-agitated question, will aid<sup>o</sup> also in reviving a taste for the illustrious authors who<sup>o</sup>

flourished in the most momentous epoch of our political and religious history, and whose works contain an inexhaustible mine of most precious doctrinal and practical instruction.

With a short extract from another of these authors this Preface may be appropriately concluded. The extract is interesting and valuable as an unequivocal expression of the opinion relative to the extent of the atonement, entertained by a man whose preaching and writings have been more signally blessed of Heaven than those of almost any other preacher or writer that Britain has ever produced. And it is still more interesting and valuable as concentrating into a focus a large portion of the light reflected on this subject from that Sun, of whose beams human luminaries are merely the media of transmission, and severed from which the light in them is but darkness. “Would you believe,” says Richard Baxter, “that Christ died for all men, if the Scriptures plainly speak it? If you would, do but tell me what words can you devise, or would you wish, more plain for it, than are there used? Is it not enough that Christ is called ‘the Saviour of the world?’ You will say, But is it of the whole world? Yes; it saith, ‘He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world.’ Will you say, But it is not for all men in the world. Yes; it saith he died for all men as well as for the world. But you will say, It means all the elect; if it said so of any non-elect, I would believe. Yes; it speaks of these that ‘denied the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.’”

*Berwick.*

R. B.

---

NOTE.

In republishing the following Tract, it was found inconvenient, and was not thought necessary, to print the Greek terms occasionally introduced by the Author in his quotations from the New Testament.



THE EXTENT  
OF THE  
DEATH OF CHRIST.

---

HAVING shewed what manner of price this is, viz., redemptive from evil, procurative of good, and sufficient for both, I pass on to the last question.

For whom was this price paid ? And this I shall cleave asunder into two queries.

I. Whether Christ died for all men ?

II. Whether he died equally for all men ?

In both which, whilst I name the death of Christ only, according to the usual language of divines, I comprehend his whole obedience, active and passive, whereof his death was the complement and extreme act.

I. As to the first query, Whether Christ died for all men ? I answer affirmatively, that he did ; and here I shall do two things :

First. I shall lay down the reasons of my opinion.

Secondly. I shall answer the objections made against it ; and in both it will appear how far, or in what sense I assert that Christ died for all men.

First. I shall lay down my reasons for it, and these are drawn

(1.) From the will of God as the fountain of redemption.

(2.) From the covenant of grace as the charter of it, and the promises comprised therein.

(3.) From the ministers' commission who publish it.

(4.) From certain blessings which are the fruits of it.

(5.) From the unbelief of men, which is the denial of it.

(6.) From the fulness and glorious redundancy of merit in Christ's death which paid for it.

(7.) From the large and general expressions in Scripture concerning the same.

(1.) I argue from the will of God. God's will of salvation as the fonsal cause thereof, and Christ's death as the meritorious cause thereof are of equal latitude: God's will of salvation doth not extend beyond Christ's death; for then he should intend to save some *extra Christum*—without Christ: neither doth Christ's death extend beyond God's will of salvation, for then he should die for some whom God would upon no terms save; but these two are exactly coextensive. Hence it is observable, that when the apostle speaks of Christ's love to the church, he speaks also of his *giving himself for it*, Eph. v. 25. And when he saith, "God will have all men to be saved," 1 Tim. ii. 4, he saith withal, "Christ gave himself a ransom for all," ver. 6. Therefore there cannot be a truer measure of the extent of Christ's death, than God's will of salvation, out of which the same did issue; so far forth as that will of salvation extends to all men, so far forth the death of Christ doth extend to all men. Now then, how far doth God will the salvation of all? Surely thus far, that if they believe they shall be saved: no divine can deny it, especially seeing Christ himself hath laid it down so positively, "This is the will of him that sent me, (saith he,) that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life," John vi. 40. Wherefore if God will the salvation of all men thus far, that if they believe they shall be saved; then Christ died for all men thus far, that if they believe they shall be saved. But you will say, that promise, "Whosoever believes shall be saved," is but *voluntas signi*—the will of the sign, and not *voluntas beneplaciti*—the will of good pleasure, which is the adequate measure of Christ's

death. Unto which I answer, If that promise be *voluntas signi*, what doth it signify? What but God's will? What will but that good pleasure of his, that "whosoever believes shall be saved?" How else is the sign of the true God a true sign? Whence is that universal connexion betwixt faith and salvation? Is it not a plain efflux or product from the decree of God? Doth not that evidently import a decree, that "whosoever believes shall be saved?" Surely it cannot be a false sign; wherefore so far God's will of salvation extends to all men, and consequently so far Christ's death extends to them.

(2.) I argue from the covenant of grace, and the promises comprised therein. Christ is the Mediator of the covenant, and the covenant is the new testament in his blood. Christ's death doth not extend beyond the covenant, for then there should be less in the charter than in the purchase; neither doth the covenant extend beyond Christ's death, for then there should be more in the charter than in the purchase: but both these run parallel in extent. Therefore so far forth as the covenant extends to all men, so far forth the death of Christ extends to all men. Now then for the extent of the covenant. Are not those promises, "Whosoever believes shall be saved," "Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely," with the like, a part of the covenant? and are they not extensive to all men? Both are as plain as if they were written with a sun-beam: wherefore so far doth Christ's death extend to all men, as the covenant in any part thereof doth extend unto them. Moreover, these general promises undeniably extend to all men, and in that extent are infallibly true; they are all *faithful sayings*, and *words of truth*, and their truth is sealed up by Christ's blood; wherefore as these promises extend to all men, so the death of Christ, in which they are founded, doth extend to all men. If Christ did no way die for all men, which way shall the truth of these general promises be made out? "Whosoever will may take the water of life." What, though Christ never bought it for him? "Whosoever believes shall be saved." What, though there were no price paid for him? Surely the gospel knows no water of life but what Christ purchased, nor no way of salvation but by a price paid. But you will say, that albeit Christ died not for all men, yet are those general promises very true, and that because their truth is founded

upon the sufficiency of Christ's death, which hath worth enough in it to redeem millions of worlds. I answer, there is a double sufficiency, *sufficientia nuda* consisting in the intrinsical value of the thing, and *sufficientia ordinata* consisting in the intentional paying and receiving that thing as a price of redemption: the first is that radical sufficiency whereby the thing may possibly become a price, the second is that formal sufficiency whereby the thing doth actually become a price. Let a thing be of never so vast a value in itself, it is no price at all unless it be paid for that end, and being paid, it is a price for no more than those only for whom it was so paid; because the intrinsical worth, how great soever, doth not constitute it a price. Hence it is clear, that if Christ's death, though of immense value, had been paid for none, it had been no price at all; and if it were paid but for some, it was no price for the rest for whom it was not paid. These things premised, if Christ no way died for all men, how can those promises stand true? All men, if they believe, shall be saved; saved, but how? Shall they be saved by a price of redemption? There was none at all paid for them; the immense value of Christ's death doth not make it a price as to them for whom he died not; or shall they be saved without a price? God's unsatisfied justice cannot suffer it, his minatory law cannot bear it, neither doth the gospel know any such way of salvation: take it either way, the truth of those promises cannot be vindicated, unless we say that Christ died for all men. But you will yet reply, that albeit Christ died not for all, yet is the promise true; because Christ's death is not only sufficient for all in itself, but it was willed by God to be so. I answer, God willed it to be so, but how? Did he will that it should be paid for all men, and so be a sufficient price for them? Then Christ died for all men. Or did he will that it should not be paid for all men, but only be sufficient for them in its intrinsical value? Then still it is no price at all as to them; and consequently either they may be saved without a price, which is contrary to the current of the gospel, or else they cannot be saved at all, which is contrary to the truth of the promise. If it be yet further demanded, To what purpose is it to argue which way reprobates shall be saved, seeing none of them ever did or will believe? Let the apostle answer: "What if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the

faith of God without effect? God forbid; yea, let God be true, but every man a liar," Rom. iii. 3, 4. And again, "If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful; he cannot deny himself," 2 Tim. ii. 13. No reprobate ever did or will believe, yet the promise must be true, and true antecedently to the faith or unbelief of men; true because it is the promise of God, and antecedently true because else it could not be the object of faith. Wherefore I conclude that Christ died for all men so far as to found the truth of the general promises, which extend to all men.

(3.) I argue from the ministers' commission, which is, "Go, preach the gospel to every creature." By virtue of this, they command all men everywhere to repent, and to induce them thereunto, they open a door of hope to them, and to raise up that hope they set forth Jesus Christ evidently before their eyes, as if he were crucified among them, opening his bleeding wounds, and through them shewing his naked heart, and the inward bruises there made by God's wrath for man's sin; they lift up their voices and cry, "Come, O poor sinners! come, for *all things are ready*; here is Christ and his redeeming blood ready; here is an act of free grace and pardon sealed in that blood; here is a heaven of reconciliation, and at the end thereof a heaven of glory open before you; come, O come without delay! *Behold! now is the accepted time, the day of salvation*; come, and your sins shall be blotted out; come, and your souls shall live for ever; whilst it is called to-day, we beseech you, *be you reconciled unto God*. Why should your immortal souls, saveable through Christ, be choked with worldly thorns, or enchanted with base lusts, or inhabited by unclean devils? *Turn ye, turn ye; why will ye die?*" And in all this they bespeak not the elect only, but others too; for their commission reaches to *every creature*. Neither do they utter their own human passions, but pursue their divine commission; for in all their pathetical beseechings *God himself beseeches*, 2 Cor. v. 20.; in all their loud out-cries *Wisdom itself cries out*, Prov. viii. 1, 4.; in all their earnest exhortations *Christ himself stands at the door and knocks*, Rev. iii. 20.; in all their holy doctrines the kingdom of God *comes nigh unto men*, Luke x. 11.; and in all their invitations to the evangelical feast made up of Christ's flesh and blood, which is meat indeed, and drink indeed, God himself invites, and bids men *eat and drink*.

for his heart is with them. These things being so, it necessarily follows that Christ died for all men; because the oblation of Christ in the gospel is founded on his oblation on the cross, and the ministry of reconciliation is founded on the mystery of it. Hence the apostle joins both together: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation," 2 Cor. v. 19. And in another place, "Christ gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time," 1 Tim. ii. 6. The word of reconciliation is extensive to all, therefore so is the work; the price of redemption may be testified to all, therefore it was paid for all, so far as to found that testimony of Jesus which is the spirit of prophecy. But if Christ no way died for all men, how came the ministers' commission to be so large? They command men to repent, that their sins may be blotted out, but how can their sins be blotted out for whom Christ was not made sin? They beseech men to be reconciled to God, but how shall they be reconciled for whom Christ paid no price at all? They call and cry out to men to come to Christ that they may have life, but how can they have life for whom Christ was no Surety in his death? If, then, Christ died for all men, the ministry is a true ministry as to all; but if Christ died only for the elect, what is the ministry as to the rest? Those exhortations which, as to the elect, are real undissembled offers of grace, as to the rest seem to be but golden dreams and shadows; those calls which, as to the elect, are right ministerial acts, as to the rest appear as extra-ministerial blots and *erratas*; those invitations to the gospel feast which, as to the elect, are the cordial wooings and beseechings of God himself, as to the rest look like the words of mere men speaking at random and without commission: for, alas! why should they come to that feast for whom nothing is prepared? How should they eat and drink for whom the Lamb was never slain? Wherefore I conclude that Christ died for all men, so far as to found the truth of the ministry towards them.

(4.) I argue from the blessings purchased by Christ's death. One great blessing is salvation on gospel terms. Lapsed angels must be damned, but men, nay, all men, may be saved on gospel terms: there is a *common salvation* to them; and O what a blessing is this, especially to such as live under the gospel! There is nothing stands between

them and heaven but their own will: *they will not come to Christ that they may have life.* O! what would the damned spirits in hell give for such a door of hope, as hath no other bar but what is in their own hearts! How would they sweat and strive with tears and strong cries to enter in at it! A second blessing is the patience of God, which waits upon sinners, and by some glimmerings of mercy *leads them to repentance.* A third blessing is the dispensation of gifts. Even in the wilderness of the pagan world there are moral virtues, and in the *Eden* of the church there are even in those that perish, some touches of the Holy Ghost, tastes of the heavenly gift, and feelings of the powers of the world to come; and whence are these but from the death of Christ? As David called the water of Bethlehem *the blood of his worthies*, so may I call these blessings *the blood of Christ.* Wherefore Christ died so far for all as to procure some blessings for them.

(5.) I argue from the unbelief of men, which is wonderfully aggravated in Scripture. Through Jesus Christ there is a real offer of grace made, but unbelief *receives it in vain*, 2 Cor. vi. 1.; great salvation is prepared, but unbelief *neglects it*, Heb. ii. 3.; eternal rest is promised, but unbelief *comes short of it*, Heb. iv. 1.; the kingdom of heaven comes nigh to men, but unbelief *draws back from it*, Heb. x. 39. God himself bears witness that there is life in his Son, even for all, if they believe, but unbelief saith "No" to it, and doth what it can to *make him a liar*, 1 John v. 10. Christ is set forth before our eyes as the great expiatory sacrifice, and evidently set forth as if he were crucified among us; his blood runs fresh in the veins of the gospel, but unbelief *re-crucifies the Son of God*, Heb. vi. 6., *tramples his precious blood under foot*, Heb. x. 29., and doth, as it were, nullify his glorious sacrifice; so that, as to final unbelievers, *there no more remaineth a sacrifice*, Heb. x. 26.; as to their salvation, it is as if there were no sacrifice at all for them. But if Christ died not for all men, how can these things be? How can those men receive grace in vain for whom it was never procured? or neglect salvation for whom it was never prepared? How can they fall short of eternal rest for whom it was never purchased? or draw back from the kingdom of heaven which never approached unto them? How can there be life in Christ for those for whom he never died? and if not, which way doth their unbelief give God

the lie? How can they re-crucify the Son of God for whom he was never crucified? or trample on that precious blood which was never shed for them? The devils, as full of malice as they are against Christ, are never said to do it, and why are men charged with it? I take it because men have some share in him, and devils none at all.

(6.) I argue from the death of Christ, which hath a super-excellent redundancy of merit in it, not only because of its intrinsical value, but because of the Divine ordination. There are unsearchable riches in Christ, enough to pay all men's debts; there are pleonasms of grace in him, *grace superabounded*, saith the apostle, 1 Tim. i. 14. Salvation flows out from him actually upon all believers, and by a glorious super-effluence it would run over upon all men if they did believe. As it was with the widow's little pot of oil, 2 Kings, iv. 6.: the oil did run till all the vessels were full, and then it staid; the widow called for another vessel, and if she had had many more there, the oil in the pot would have filled them all. Even so (pardon the comparison) it is with the immense sea of Christ's merits; it actually fills all the vessels of faith, and then it stays as it were for want of vessels. Meanwhile Christ calls and cries out for more, and if all men would come and bring their vessels to him he would fill them all. Doubtless if all men did believe, all would see the glory of God; all would have the rivers of living water flowing in them; all would feel spiritual miracles wrought in their hearts, by that Christ who sits at the right hand of power; and consequently all would find an experimental witness in themselves that Christ died for them all.

(7.) I argue from the general and large expressions in Scripture touching Christ and his death. Christ died for all, 2 Cor. v. 15.; for every man, Heb. ii. 9.; he gave himself for the world, John vi. 51.; for the whole world, 1 John ii. 2.; he is styled the *Saviour of the world*, 1 John iv. 14., and his salvation is called a *common salvation*, Jude 3.; a *salvation prepared before the face of all people*, Luke ii. 31., and flowing forth to the ends of the earth, Isa. xlix. 6. The gospel of this salvation is to be preached to all nations, Matth. xxviii. 19.; and to every creature, Mark xvi. 15. There is *grace bringing salvation to all men*, Titus ii. 11.; a door of hope open to them, because Christ gave himself a *ransom for all*, 1 Tim. ii. 6. I

know not what could be more emphatical to point out the universality of redemption? But you will say, all these general expressions do but denote *genera singulorum*,—some of all sorts, the world of the elect, or the all of believers.

In answer to which I shall only put two queries.

1st. If those general expressions denote only the world of the elect, or the all of believers, why is it not said in Scripture, that God elected all and every man, the world and the whole world? In that sense it is as true that God elected them all, as it is that Christ died for them all. Why then doth the Holy Spirit altogether forbear those general expressions in the matter of election, which it useth in the matter of redemption? Surely it imports thus much unto us—that redemption hath a larger sphere than election; and therefore the Scriptures contract election in words of speciality only, whilst they open and dilate redemption in emphatical generalities.

2dly. If those general expressions denote only the world of the elect, or the all of believers, why doth the Scripture use such very different language in the same thing? Sometimes Christ is called *the Saviour of the world*, and sometimes *the Saviour of the body*; sometimes it is said that Christ *died* or *gave himself for all*, or *for the world*, and sometimes it is said that he *died* or *gave himself for the church*, or *for his sheep*. Who can imagine that such words of universality, and such words of speciality, should be of the same latitude? that one and the same thing should be imported in both? Moreover, the Scripture doth make a signal distinction: when it speaks of his giving himself, or dying for all, it says only that he died for all, or gave himself a ransom for all; but when it speaks of giving himself for his church, it says that “he sanctified himself, that it might be sanctified through the truth,” John xvii. 19.; and that “he gave himself for it, that he might purify to himself a peculiar people,” Tit. ii. 14.; and that “he gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it by the word, and present it to himself a glorious church without spot or wrinkle,” Eph. v. 25—27. Never in all the Scripture is it said that he gave himself for all, or for the world, that he might sanctify, or cleanse it, or make it a peculiar people, or glorious church, which yet might have been truly said, if the all were no more than the all of believers, or

the world than the world of the elect. Wherefore to me it seems clear from those various expressions, and the observable distinctions in them, that the all for whom Christ died is larger than the all of believers, and the world for whom Christ gave himself larger than the world of the elect.

Secondly. Having laid down my own reasons, I proceed to answer the objections made against this opinion.

*Object.* 1. If Christ died for all men, then all would believe; for Christ's death procures all graces, and, in particular, faith; seeing, then, all men have not faith, either Christ did not die for them all, or else he loseth part of his purchase.

I answer, that Christ's death is procurative of all graces, and particularly of faith, so far as it is a price; and it is a price so far as it was paid down by Christ, and accepted by God for that purpose: for in a price there must be both *sufficientia nuda* consisting in the intrinsical value of the thing, and *sufficientia ordinata* consisting in the intentional paying and receiving that thing as a price. Now Christ's death was paid down by him, and accepted by God as a price, with a double respect. As for all men, it was paid and accepted as a price so far forth as to procure for them a ground for their faith, viz., that they might be saved on gospel terms: and as for the elect, it was further paid and accepted as a price, so far as to procure the very grace of faith for them. Thus our Saviour Christ, who best knew both upon what terms he paid down the price, and upon what terms his Father received it, opens this mysterious dispensation: "I came down from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me," John vi. 38., and what was that? As to all men it was, that "every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life," ver. 40., and as to the elect it was, that "all those should by faith come unto him," ver. 37., and "never be lost," ver. 39. Christ, then, died for all men, not so far forth as to procure the grace of faith, but so far forth as to procure salvation on gospel terms for them; therefore, albeit all do not believe, it follows not either that Christ did not at all die for them, or that he loseth part of his purchase. Christ's death is procurative of faith, not in reference to all, but to the elect.

*Object.* 2. If Christ died for all men, why is not the

gospel revealed to them? Many pagan nations have no glimpse of a Christ.

I answer two things.

(1.) God hath not left himself altogether without witness; no, not in the pagan world. The invisible Spirit renders himself *visible* in the glass of the world, Rom. i. 20., and, as it were, *palpable* in the body of nature; the very heathens may *see and feel him in every creature*, Acts xvii. 27.; nay, and in themselves too, for his presence is *not far off from them*, and *his candle* burns within them, Prov. xx. 27.; and when, by this candle, it appears that there is justice in God, and sin in them, yet that they may still *seek after him*, he lets out some glimmerings of mercy and placability towards them: the very standing of the world utters somewhat of this. The psalmist tells us of *a line in the heaven*, Psal. xix. 4. God, in the creation, drew lines of power and wisdom over the sphere of nature; but Christ, in redemption, struck a line of mercy quite through it, and that legible even to the heathens, forasmuch as they know *the vindictive justice of God*, Rom. i. 32., and yet see the world standing, and not dashed down about the sinners' ears; they know there is *a divine vengeance*, Acts xxviii. 4., and yet they are not consumed; they see justice, as it were, *winking*; Acts xvii. 30.; *judgment slumbering*, 2 Pet. ii. 3.; and infinite patience and long-suffering *waiting and leading them to repentance*, Rom. ii. 4. They have some glimpses of pardoning mercy: where there is no pardoning mercy at all, there is no room for repentance: but the patience of God is a kind of temporal pardon of the punishment, and that temporal pardon of the punishment points out that mercy which can give an absolute pardon of the sin, and the true duct and tendency of that mercy is to lead men to repentance; and if there were any man in the pagan world who did in truth repent, and convert to God, I make no question at all but that he should be saved, and probably not without the express knowledge of Christ indulged to him; for "upon all that fear God's name will the Sun of Righteousness arise with healing under his wings," Mal. iv. 2. Here, then, is *aliquid evangelii*—something of the gospel, though not the express knowledge of Christ.

(2.) As to the argument, let us weigh what may be deducted from Christ's death as universal. If Christ died for all men, it follows from thence that Christ may be

preached to all, but it follows not from thence that Christ shall be preached to all. It follows that Christ may be preached to all, for he who was offered for all on the cross may be offered to all in the gospel: there is no pagan in the world to whom Christ may not be offered. And if there were but one great ear or organ of hearing common to all, how would Christ's ministers always be filling it with gospel! But it follows not that Christ shall be preached to all; for the gospel is God's own, and he may do with his own as he pleaseth; and Christ who purchased for all the being of the gospel, as far as the general promises go, yet purchased not for all the publication thereof. In a word, the pagans have some glimmerings of gospel, and may be saved on gospel terms, which shews that Christ so far died for them; and that they have not the express knowledge of Christ is a deep abyss much fitter to be adored than dived into by us.

*Object.* 3. If Christ died for all men, then he intercedes for all; but he intercedes only for the elect, therefore he died for them only.

I answer, that Christ doth in some sort intercede for all men; and this I shall clear several ways.

(1.) From the nature of Christ's intercession: that is not a formal prayer, but an appearing in the holy of holies before the face of God as an Advocate, and there presenting his blood and righteousness in their freshness and endless life of merit, with a will that all the grace purchased thereby may be dispensed to the sons of men. Therefore Christ even in glory stands *as one slain*, Rev. v. 6., shewing his bleeding wounds to make intercession with God. Hence it follows, that his intercession, being a kind of celestial oblation, perfectly answers to his oblation on the cross; he is an Advocate above, so far as he was a Surety here below; his blood speaks the very same things in heaven as it did on earth, and his will stands in the same posture towards sinners there as here. Now, how far was Christ a Surety for all? Surely thus far, that all may be saved if they believe; else either they cannot be saved at all, which is contrary to the truth of the promise, or they may be saved without a Surety, which is contrary to the current of the Scriptures. But if he were so far a Surety for all, then he is so far an Advocate for all; for he appears an Advocate in heaven for all those for whom he appeared as

a Surety on the cross. Hence the apostle saith in general, "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father," 1 John ii. 1.; he saith not strictly, if the elect sin, but at large, *If any man sin, we have an Advocate*; and, as the true ground-work of this general advocation, he adds, "He is the propitiation for the whole world," ver. 2. So far forth as he was a propitiation for the world, so far forth he is an Advocate for it. And another apostle affirms that Christ is a "Mediator between God and men," 1 Tim. ii. 5.; he saith not betwixt God and his church, but *betwixt God and men*; and the following words give the true reason of it, "Christ gave himself a ransom for all," ver. 6.; he is no less a Mediator for all than he was a Ransom for all. Christ's blood shed on the cross spake thus far for all men, that they might have their pardon on gospel terms; and afterwards being carried to heaven it speaks the very same language for them; for the voice or speech of that blood is its merit, and that merit is of an indefinite virtue. Hence that blood cannot be speechless, because it cannot be meritless; and so far on earth as it merited for all, so far in heaven it speaks and intercedes for all. Moreover, as Christ's blood speaks the same things for them in heaven as it did on earth, so Christ's will in heaven stands in the same posture towards them as it did on earth; wherefore, in a sort, he intercedes for all.

(2.) From the patience of God which waits on men, even such as at last perish. If Christ did not stand with the incense of his sweet-smelling merits between the living and the dead, between the reprieved sinners on earth and the damned spirits in hell, the patience of God would not wait one moment upon them.

(3.) From the working of God's Spirit; for as Christ is *our Paraclete or Advocate in heaven*, 1 John ii. 1., so the Holy Spirit is *God's Paraclete or Advocate on earth*, John xvi. 7. Surely if the Advocate in heaven spake nothing for the non-elect, the Advocate on earth would not woo them to salvation; if the blood of Christ did not at all plead for them, the Spirit of Christ would give no touches at all upon them, much less such touches as to make them taste the powers of the world to come.

(4.) From the liberty of prayer. Simon Magus, even *whilst in the gall of bitterness*, was commanded to pray, Acts viii. 22., but, what, without a Mediator? No, surely;

that sinful man who hath no Mediator in heaven must not presume to pray on earth. I see no reason why a man merely mediatorless should have more leave to pray than a devil, who is therefore without hope because without a mediator. The apostle commands men to *pray everywhere*, 1 Tim. ii. 8., but a little before he lays down this as the ground-work, "There is one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a Ransom for all," ver. 5, 6. The mediation of Christ opens the door to prayer.

Wherefore as to this objection I answer thus: Christ intercedes for all men in such sort as he died for them; I say in such sort, for there is a vast difference between his general intercession for all, and his special intercession for the elect: for as Christ, by his blood shed on the cross, merited for all in general that they might be saved on gospel terms, and merited for the elect in special, that they should believe and be saved; so, by the same blood presented in heaven, he intercedes for all, that they may be saved on gospel terms, and intercedes for the elect, that they may believe and be saved. And thus he is the complete Mediator of the covenant; as the general promises extend to all, so answerably he intercedes for all; and as the special promises point only at the elect, so proportionably he intercedes for the elect.

*Object.* 4. If Christ died for all men, then he was a Surety for all, and satisfied for the sins of all, and consequently God hath a double satisfaction—one in Christ, the Surety, and another in the persons of the damned, which is against the nature of his justice.

In this argument are two consequences to be weighed.

1st. If Christ died for all, then he was a Surety for all, and satisfied for the sins of all.

2dly. If Christ so satisfied for the sins of all, then God hath a double satisfaction, which is against justice.

As to the first consequence, I admit it as a very truth, that Christ was a Surety for all, and satisfied for the sins of all; for if all did believe and repent, the sins of all should be remitted; and remitted they could not be without a Surety, and a Surety making satisfaction; therefore such a Surety was Christ for them all.

As to the second consequence, if Christ satisfied for the sins of all, then God hath a double satisfaction, and that is

against justice. I shall first premise some distinctions, and then answer.

1. I shall premise three distinctions.

(1.) Either the first satisfaction was made to the Creditor or Law-giver by the debtor or offender himself, or else it was made by a Surety; if it was made by himself, justice forbids a second satisfaction.

(2.) The first satisfaction being made by a Surety, was either made by a surety of the debtors' or offenders' own procuring, or else by a Surety procured by the Creditor or Law-giver; if it was made by a surety procured by the debtor or offender himself, justice forbids a second satisfaction; for it is all one as if he had satisfied by himself.

(3.) When a Surety provided by the Creditor or Law-giver makes the first satisfaction, either he makes satisfaction in such sort as that the debtor or offender shall be thereby immediately, *ipso facto*, without any more ado, discharged; or else he makes satisfaction in such sort as that the debtor or offender shall be thereby discharged, but upon the performance of some conditions, and not otherwise. If the surety make satisfaction in the former way, still justice forbids a second satisfaction; but if he make satisfaction in the latter way, then upon the final non-performance of those conditions justice may admit a second satisfaction. I will illustrate this by two instances: suppose a man indebted to another in £1000, the creditor procures his son to lay down the money in satisfaction of the debt, but withal it is agreed between them that the debtor shall be discharged from his debt, if he assent to this payment, and not otherwise; if, then, the debtor dissent, the creditor may justly demand of him a second satisfaction. Again: suppose multitudes of attainted traitors be shut up in prison, and the king procures his son to suffer punishment in their stead, but withal the king and his son proclaim it as a law, that none of the traitors shall be thereby absolved unless such as honour and do homage unto them; if any traitor refuse to do it, the king may justly exact a second satisfaction: and the reason of both is this, because the debtor or traitor not performing the conditions can have no benefit by the first satisfaction, and therefore must be subject to a second, as if there had been no first at all.

2. These distinctions premised, I answer, men's sins are debts and rebellions, and satisfaction for them is due

to God as the great Creditor and Law-giver ; but this satisfaction was not made by men themselves, but by Jesus Christ, as their Surety, and this Surety was not procured by men, but provided by God himself ; and, being provided by God, he did not pay down his satisfactory blood in such sort as that men should be thereby immediately, *ipso facto*, absolved from their debts and rebellions, but in such sort as that men may be acquitted from their debts and rebellions if they repent and believe : wherefore if they do neither, they can have no benefit by Christ's satisfaction, and by consequence a second satisfaction may be justly exacted from them.

Now, for the more distinct clearing of this momentous objection, I shall propose four things.

(1.) God, out of mere grace, procured Christ to be a Surety for men ; and therefore it was in his power to prescribe the conditions, upon the performance or non-performance whereof men should have or not have benefit by Christ's satisfaction.

(2.) According to this power God hath plainly set down the conditions in the gospel, viz., "He that believes shall be saved ; and he that believes not shall be condemned."

(3.) These conditions being thus set down by God himself, no man falling short of them can have benefit by Christ's satisfaction. If men will not receive *the atonement*, Rom. v. 11., how can they be at peace ? If they will not receive *remission of sins*, Acts x. 43., how can they be pardoned ? We are all in a worse dungeon than Jeremy's, and if we will not put the cords of grace under our arms we cannot get out : we are all servants of sin, and if we say to it, We love thee, and will not go out free, we must be bored for eternal slaves. Christ hath opened the fountain of his blood, but we must wash in it, Zech. xiii. 1. Christ hath made a purchase of souls, but we must believe to *the purchasing of the soul*, Heb. x. 39. Not that faith is part of the purchase-money, but that it is the condition of the gospel, without which the glorious purchase of Christ profits not : if men live and die in unbelief, *there remaineth no more sacrifice for them*, Heb. x. 26. Indeed Christ offered a sacrifice for them, but the benefit of that sacrifice doth no more remain unto them : upon their final unbelief they have no more benefit by it than if there had been none at all for them.

(4.) If final unbelievers can have no benefit by Christ's satisfaction, then God may justly require a second satisfaction of them, because they cannot plead the first; and so it is in law as to them as if there had been no first at all. Shimei had a pardon from Solomon, but, passing over Kidron, lost it; and therefore, notwithstanding the same, was justly put to death for his offence. Jesus Christ, as a Surety, made satisfaction for men, but they, through their final unbelief, lose the benefit of it; and therefore, notwithstanding the same, God may justly require a second satisfaction from them. If Shimei had pleaded his pardon, Solomon would have told him, That is nothing to thee ever since thou didst pass over Kidron; and if unbelievers should plead Christ's satisfaction, God would tell them, That is nothing to you, seeing you have lived and died in unbelief.

*Object.* 5. Millions of men in the world reject Christ, and drop into hell, and God eternally foresaw that it would be so; if, then, Christ died for these, there seems to be a blot upon the divine wisdom, a failure in his efficacious will, and a loss in the precious purchase made by Christ.

I answer, It is true that God eternally foresaw those rejecters of Christ, and that Christ in time died for them, nevertheless there is no blot hereby cast on the divine wisdom: it is no disparagement to the all-wise God to bestow means of eternal bliss on such as he eternally foresaw would abuse the same to their own destruction. O! what rare perfections did he set up in the angels, and yet he eternally foresaw a great part of them apostatizing and dropping to hell. What an excellent image of holiness did he stamp upon Adam? and yet he eternally foresaw him falling, and breaking all his glory by the fall. What waitings of patience, wooings of the gospel, and touches of the Holy Spirit, doth he dispense to such men as he eternally foresaw would abuse all these? and yet in all this God's wisdom suffers not. The very same I may say of Christ's dying for such as abuse this great blessing. Neither is there here any failing in the efficacious will of God; for he wills that the elect shall believe and be saved, and he wills that the rest shall be saved if they believe; and both these wills are accomplished, the first in the event of faith and salvation, and the latter in the connexion between faith and salvation, even as to all men. God may be said to will the salvation of men, through Christ's death, two ways: either because

he wills that Christ's death should be a price infallibly procuring their faith and salvation ; or else because he wills that there should be in Christ's death an aptness and sufficiency to save them on gospel terms : the former will points only at the elect, and is fulfilled in their grace and glory ; the latter extends to all men, and is fulfilled in the aptness and sufficiency of Christ's death to save them on gospel terms. In both God's will hath its effect. Neither, lastly, is there any loss in Christ's purchase, for what did he purchase ? As for the elect, he purchased faith and salvation ; and as for the rest, he purchased salvation on gospel terms : in both he hath what he paid for ; for the elect believe and are saved, and the rest may be saved if they believe : therefore when men, by their unbelief, bar themselves of the benefit of Christ's death, and make him, in that respect, cry out, *I have laboured in vain*, yet he adds, *surely my judgment is with the Lord*, Isa. xlix. 4. ; as if he had said, For all this never a drop of my blood is irrationally shed, for God, with whom my judgment is, knows that I purchased salvation for them on gospel terms, although they, by their unbelief, deprive themselves of the benefit of the purchase. If final unbelievers should be saved, Christ should have more than his purchase, but if they are not saved, he hath no less ; for he purchased salvation for them on gospel terms, which they do not perform through their own voluntary unbelief.

*Object.* 6. If Christ died for all men, then he loves all with the greatest degree of love ; for " greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends," John xv. 13. ; and this must needs be the greatest degree of love, because it draws all other things after it : " If God gave his own Son for us, how shall he not with him freely give us all things ?" Rom. viii. 32. But Christ doth not love all with the greatest degree of love, neither doth God give all things to them ; therefore Christ did not die for all.

I confess that Christ doth not love all men with the greatest degree of love, neither doth God bestow all blessings on them ; wherefore we must examine these places from whence these inferences are made. As for the first place, " Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends," it doth import one of these two things, either it doth import, that he that dieth for his

friends hath the greatest degree or height of internal love towards them, or else it imports, that a man's death for his friends is the greatest external effect and proof of his love. The first cannot be the meaning of the place ; for if it be the greatest and most intense degree of love to die for our friends, what is it to die for our enemies, as Christ did ? If it be the height and top of love to lay down our lives, how can that be done without any love at all, as the apostle supposeth ? 1 Cor. xiii. 3. The apostle commands us to " lay down our lives for the brethren," 1 John iii. 16., but when a man doth it, he is not to have the same degree of love towards all the brethren ; for he is to love those most in whom there is most of God, and to whom he is nearest in nature. Jesus Christ laid down his life for all the elect, yet without doubt his love was greater to his apostles than to ordinary Christians ; nay, and among the apostles there was one dearly beloved, one who " lay in his bosom," John xiii. 23. Wherefore the meaning of the words is not, that he that dieth for his friends hath the greatest degree or height of internal love towards them, but that such a death is the greatest effect and proof of his love. Christ in the 12th verse exhorted his disciples to love one another, and in this 13th verse he shews what is the greatest outward evidence of love, viz., to die for our friends. Now, albeit Christ died for all men, and that death was a great and high proof of his love, nothing hinders but that Christ, over and besides his common philanthropy to all, may bear a special affection to the elect : the universality of his death infers not a parity in his love. If Jacob had died for all his sons, yet he might have loved Joseph and Benjamin above the rest, and left them some special legacies : if Christ died for all men, yet he may and doth love his elect above others, and leave some secret love-tokens upon their hearts. As for the second place, " If God delivered up his Son for us, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things ?" Rom. viii. 32., the key to unlock this text is the word *us*. Who are the *us* in the text ? Who but " the elect of God ?" ver. 33., who, according to election, are effectually *called*, ver. 28., and upon their callings are *justified and glorified*, ver. 30. These are the *us* in the text ; wherefore the plain meaning of it is, not that if God gave his Son for all men, he would give them all things, but that if God gave his Son

for the elect, he would give them all things, viz., all things necessary to salvation ; the text extends not to all men. But you will say, Though the text extends not to all men, yet the argument doth ; for, if the argument be good, that if God gave his Son for the elect, he would give them all things ; then the argument is as good, that if God gave his Son for all men, he would give them all things. I answer, that if God's intention and love in giving his Son for all were one and the same towards all, the consequence were undeniable ; but seeing God, in giving his Son, had towards the elect, a special love and intention to bestow grace and glory on them, and towards the rest but a common philanthropy and ordination that they might be saved on gospel terms ; hence it is clear, that albeit the giving of all things to the elect may be inferred from his giving his Son for them, yet the giving of all things to all men cannot be inferred from his giving his Son for them all ; because in that gift there was not the same love and intention towards all. Wherefore I conclude that Christ died for all, and yet neither are all loved with the greatest degree of love, nor yet are all blessings conferred upon them.

*Object.* 7. If Christ would not pray for all men, then he died not for all ; but Christ would not pray for all, for he saith, "I pray for them : I pray not for the world," John xvii. 9.

*Answ.* This argument must be formed one of these two ways : either thus, If Christ prayed not at all for the non-elect, then he did not at all die for them ; but he prayed not at all for them, ergo, he died not for them. Now here I must deny the minor ; for even upon the cross he prayed for his crucifiers, "Father, forgive them," Luke xxiii. 34, not that he would have them forgiven though final impenitents and unbelievers, for that would have been against his Father's purpose and his own purchase, but that he would have them forgiven if they did believe and repent, which was congruous to both. But suppose there had been no vocal prayer of Christ for them, yet surely there was a mental one ; for he could not but desire of God to have all the fruits of his passion, amongst which one was, that all men might be saved on gospel terms ; that grand gospel axiom, *whosoever believes shall be saved*, was no doubt one of his desires, for it cost his precious blood ; wherefore the non-elect were not totally excluded from his prayers. Or

else the argument must be formed thus: If Christ prayed not for the non-elect in that famous prayer, John xvii., then he did not die for them; but he prayed not for them in that prayer, therefore he died not for them. Now here the consequence fails; for what kind of prayer was that, John xvii.? It was a prayer peculiarly fitted for apostles and believers; a prayer for their perseverance in faith, ver. 11., for their perfection in unity, ver. 23., for their growth in sanctification, ver. 17., for their abode with him in glory, ver. 24., and in all respects a prayer which could be congruously prayed for no other but believers, ver. 20. Now that Christ did not pray such a prayer for all men as was only proper for believers, doth not conclude, either that he did not at all pray for them, or that he did not at all die for them. Thus much in answer to the first query, Whether Christ died for all men? I pass on to the second.

II. Whether Christ died equally for all men? I answer, that albeit Christ died in some sort for all men, and, by virtue of his death, all men, if believers, should equally be saved; nevertheless Christ did not die equally for them all, but after a special manner for the elect, above and beyond all others; and this I shall demonstrate by several arguments drawn

1. From the will of God.
2. From the covenant of grace.
3. From the issue of Christ.
4. From the working of the Holy Spirit.
5. From the blessings purchased.
6. From the intercession of Christ.
7. From the event following upon Christ's Death.
8. From the special expressions in Scripture.

1. I argue from the will of God. Christ's death is the meritorious cause of salvation, and respects men more or less proportionably as God's will, which is the fontal cause thereof, doth more or less respect them. God wills that all men should be saved, if they believe, and proportionably Christ died for them all: God wills that the elect should infallibly believe and be saved, and suitably Christ died for them in a special way: there is a peculiarity in Christ's redemption answering to the peculiarity of God's love. God eternally resolved with himself that he would have a church and a peculiar people, and "Christ gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the

washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, without spot or wrinkle," Eph. v. 25—27. "He gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works," Tit. ii. 14. If Christ had given himself thus far for all, all would have been his church and people. You will say, Unbelief is the only obstacle. I answer, that if Christ had given himself for all, that he might wash them as he washes the church, and redeem them from all iniquity as he redeems his peculiar ones, there would have been no such thing as unbelief left among men: that Christ, who *washes out every spot and wrinkle*, would not have left unbelief; that Christ, who *redeems from all iniquity*, would not have left unbelief, no, not in any one man's heart. Nay, I may truly say, he could not leave it there, because he could not lose his end, nor shed one drop of his blood in vain. There are among men some chosen ones, such as are "chosen out from among men," and "chosen out of the world," John xv. 19., and Christ in his death had a special eye upon these. Hence, proportionably to their election, they are said to be "redeemed from among men," Rev. xiv. 4., and "redeemed out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation," Rev. v. 9. Now, how is it possible that all men should be thus redeemed? Christ's death, as it respects all men, redeems them, as I may so say, from among devils, for that it renders them capable of mercy which devils are not; but Christ's death, as it respects the elect, redeems them even *from among men*, for that it procures faith for them, and thereby pulls them out of the unbelieving world; and what is peculiar redemption if this be not? But you will say, These are said to be redeemed from among men, not because Christ specially died for them above others; but because these particularly applied his death, by faith, which others did not. I answer, that either this application by faith was merited by Christ's death or not: if so, then Christ redeemed them in a special manner, because, by his death, he impetrated faith for them, which he did not for all; if not, then they were redeemed from among men by themselves and their own free will, and not by Christ and his death; which, I tremble to think, puts the lie upon the church triumphant, who sing the new song to the Lamb, in these words, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to

God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation," Rev. v. 9. How can that blood of Christ, which merited alike for all men, redeem one man from another? How can it redeem some from among men, unless it merit for them that faith which is the grand distinction between man and man in the matter of salvation? Christ "purchased the church with his blood," Acts xx. 28., and purchased it in a special manner. Hence *a purchased people* is not a title common to all, but proper to the church, 1 Pet. ii. 9. God's children lay scattered up and down the wide world, and Christ *died that he might gather them all together into one*—one faith here, and one glory hereafter, John xi. 52. If Christ had died so for all, all should have come into the same unity. We find in Scripture many signal distinctions made among men: there are some "on whom God will have mercy," and others "whom he will harden," Rom. ix. 18.; some "written in the Lamb's book of life," and others "left out of it," Rev. xiii. 8.; some "given unto Christ," John vi. 36., and others left to themselves; some are "God's own jewels," Mal. iii. 17., and others but as dross. Now, how incredible is it, that Jesus Christ, who came to do his Father's will, should, in his death, respect those whom God will harden as much as those whom he will have mercy on; those that are out of the book of life, as much as those that are in it; those that are left to themselves, as much as those that are given to him; and those that are the dross of the world, as much as God's own jewels? Believe it who can, it is a monstrous opinion, worthy of nothing but exile from Christians: seeing God's will hath so distinguished men, it is no more possible that Christ should die alike for all, than that he should dissent from his Father's will, which to do was his great errand in the world. Christ suffered between two thieves, a type of the elect and reprobate world; but who dare say that he had as much respect to the one as to the other?

2. I argue from the covenant of grace. Christ is *the Mediator of the covenant*, and the covenant is *the new testament in his blood*; as then the covenant is more or less respective of men, so the Mediator's death is more or less respective of them. There are in the covenant two sorts of promises; the one general and conditional, such are those, *Whosoever believes shall be saved*; *Whosoever will, may take of the water of life*; *If any man come to Christ*

*he will not cast him out* : the other special and absolute, such are those, *I will circumcise thy heart to love me* ; *I will put my fear in their hearts* ; *I will take away the heart of stone, and give an heart of flesh* ; *I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes* ; *I will put my laws in their mind, and write them in their hearts, and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people*. There is a vast difference between these promises, for,

(1.) The general and conditional promises are, as it were, the hands of the covenant, pointing out the true way and path leading to salvation ; but the special and absolute promises are, as it were, the veins of the covenant, carrying in them the blood and spirit of life and power to enable us to walk in that way. Here God himself engages to work all saving graces in us. Are our hearts hard ? He will roll away the stone from them. Do our hearts resist holy impressions ? He will give us hearts of flesh capable thereof. Are our hearts void of God's law ? He will write it there, and turn them into the epistles of Christ ; and, for the effectual doing hereof, he will put his Spirit into us, and, as a real proof of it, he will cause us to walk in his ways ; and in this walk *love* shall be the *motive*, for he will circumcise the heart to *love* him ; and *fear* the *bridle*, for he will put his *fear* in the heart *never to depart from him* ; and, which is the crown of all, he himself will be a God to us, and we shall be a people to him in an everlasting covenant. Stand still, O saints ! and adore. Here, lo, here is *the ministration of the Spirit indeed*, 2 Cor. iii. 8. ; here are *words which are spirit and life*, John vi. 63. ; here is *the supernal Jerusalem, the mother of spiritual freedom*, Gal. iv. 26. ; here is *the immortal seed, which begets all the sons of God*, 1 Pet. i. 23. ; here is that formative virtue, which moulds us into *the divine nature*, 2 Pet. i. 4. ; here is *the day of God's power, which makes his people willing to serve him in the beauties of holiness*, Psal. cx. 3. Happy, yea, thrice happy they, who dwell in this land of promise, and drink of these wells of salvation.

(2.) The general and conditional promises are extensive to all men, but the special and absolute promises respect the elect, and them only ; for they are fulfilled in them, and them only. Had these extended to all, that God who cannot lie nor deny himself would have fulfilled them in all.

You will say, He would have fulfilled them in all, but that men themselves will not. But what a strange word is this, they will not? Will they not, if God give them a will, *a new heart and a new spirit?* Will they not, if God take away the nilling and resisting principle, *the heart of stone?* Will they not, if God write his laws in their hearts and inward parts? O! what is this, but by an absurd blasphemy to change God's truth into a lie, his omnipotence into weakness, and his glory into the old broken idol of creature-freedom? Surely if God, who is truth and power, engage to make a new heart, the old one cannot hinder it; if he promise to remove hardness, hardness cannot resist it; if he say that he will write the law in the heart, the heart will not say nay to his almighty fingers. Seeing then these promises are not fulfilled in all, but in the elect only, I may safely affirm that they respect not all, but the elect only. These things being so, it appears how and in what manner Christ's death respects men, even more or less, as the promises of the covenant founded on his blood do more or less respect them. As the general promises extend to all men, so the death of Christ the Mediator proportionably extends to them all; and as the special promises point only at the elect, so the death of Christ the Mediator hath a peculiar respect to them. Christ, by his death, over and besides the general promises, founded those special promises for the elect; hence they come to be *sons of promise*, Gal. iv. 28., begotten by it to spiritual life, which others, standing only under the general promises, are not. All the saving graces of the elect suiting to those special promises are no other than the fruits of Christ's merits; they are renewed with the renewings of the Holy Ghost, but that is *shed on them through Jesus Christ*; they have the law written in their hearts, but that is the *epistle of Christ*; their filthy flesh is cut off from their hearts, that they may love God, who is a pure Spirit, but this is the *circumcision of Christ*, Col. ii. 11. In a word, all the saving graces of the elect are as so many legacies of the New Testament, and the New Testament is founded in his blood. Wherefore it is clear from the covenant of grace, and its special respect to the elect, that Christ died in a special and peculiar manner for them.

3. I argue from the issue of Christ: Christ was to have a seed, and this I shall demonstrate three ways.

(1.) From the preciousness of his blood.

(2.) From the purpose of his Father.

(3.) From the promise of his Father.

(1.) From the preciousness of his blood. That there should be a laver made of God's blood, and never a sinner washed in it; that such a vast sum of precious merits should be paid down, and never a captive released by it, is to me no less than prodigious blasphemy. Every little grain in nature doth confute it; if that do but fall into the ground and die, it bringeth forth much fruit; and shall the Son of God bleed and die in his assumed flesh and be fruitless? God in his waky providence gives to every little seed his own body, and shall the peerless Flower of heaven sow his blood and righteousness and have none at all? A cup of cold water given in charity shall in no wise lose its reward, and can it be so with the blood of Christ poured out in a transcendent excess of love, and glorified into an infinite merit by his Deity? When Christ fed the multitude but with barley loaves and small fishes, nothing was lost, and can all be lost when he makes a feast of spiritual marrow and fatness, and gives his flesh to be meat indeed, and his blood to be drink indeed? Oh! far be the thought from every Christian.

(2.) From the Father's purpose, which, as the Scriptures hold forth, clearly was, that his Son should be a King, a Captain, a Shepherd, a Husband, a Head, and a Father. And what is a king without subjects, a captain without soldiers, a shepherd without a flock, a husband without a spouse, an head without a body, and a father without posterity? Empty names are below him whose *name is above every name*. Wherefore this King must have *a Sion, a mountain of holiness to reign in*, Psal. ii. 6.; this Captain *a militia, an army with banners to fight under him*, Cant. vi. 4.; this Shepherd *a flock to hear his voice, and follow him*, John x. 4.; this Husband *a spouse, a queen in gold of Ophir married to him*, Psal. xlv. 9.; this Head *a body to be animated with his Spirit, and filled with his life*, Col. i. 18.; and this Father *a numerous issue, begotten and brought forth into the spiritual world, to honour and serve him*, Heb. ii. 13.

(3.) From the Father's promise, which was *in terminis, that he should have a seed*, Isa. liii. 10.; a seed begotten by his Spirit, and by that generation bearing his image, and in that image serving of him; and to make it sure, God

engages, by special promises, to take away the stony heart, to write the law there, to put his Holy Spirit into them, and so infallibly to raise up a seed to him ; and for the continuance of this seed successively, *filiabatur nomen ejus*—*his name shall be sonned or childed from generation to generation*, Psal. lxxii. 17. The special promises shall be ever budding and blossoming, and bringing forth the fruits of grace ; thus Christ *shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied*, Isa. liii. 11., and, as a sign of this satisfaction, he breaks out, *Behold I and the children which God hath given me*, Heb. ii. 13. Should he miss but one of his seed or children, his heart would not rest or be satisfied ; for they are in a peculiar manner the travail of his soul.

But now, if Christ died alike or equally for all, what becomes of his precious blood ? How can the purpose and promise of God stand ? Which way shall Christ have a seed ? Shall his seed be begotten out of man's will ? No such generation ever was there, John i. 13. *It is not of him that willeth*, Rom. ix. 16. Nothing less than the Holy Spirit, which formed Christ in the womb, can form him in the heart : but shall they be begotten by the Holy Spirit ? That Spirit doth nothing in the work of regeneration but what Christ merited in his passion ; every new creature which is efficiently begotten by the Spirit, was first meritoriously begotten by the death of Christ, or else it would not be the seed of Christ, at least not the travail of his soul. Now Christ did not travail or merit for all men that they should be begotten again by the Holy Ghost ; for then either all would be so begotten, which experience denies, or else the merit and travail of Christ must be lost, which the preciousness thereof abhors. And if Christ did not merit it for all, then neither did he, if he died alike for all, merit it for any, and how then shall he have a seed ? His seed must be begotten by the Spirit, and the Spirit begets no new creatures but what Christ merited ; and Christ dying equally for all, did not merit such a thing for any, because not for all. Moreover, when God promised Christ a seed, either the meaning of that promise was, that some men should become his seed, or that all should be so : if that some, then Christ died not equally for all ; if that all, then all must be begotten by the Spirit, and renewed after Christ's image : the stone must be cut out of every heart, and the law written there ; for in these things is the very spirit

and life of regeneration. But seeing these things are not wrought in all, it appears that the promised seed is not all, but some, for whom Christ merited the very work of regeneration.

4. I argue from the working of the Holy Spirit. As the Holy Spirit eternally proceeds from the Father and the Son in his personal subsistence, so he goes forth in time from the Father and the Son in his working in men. Hence he is called *the Spirit of the Father*, and *the Spirit of the Son*; *the Father sends him*, and *the Son sends him*; and as the Holy Spirit works in men from the Father and the Son, so he works in them more or less, as the love of the Father and the merits of the Son do more or less respect them. The Father doth in some sort love, and the Son did in some sort die for all men. Hence the Holy Spirit hath some workings in the non-elect. Within the church many of them taste the powers of the world to come; nay, in the pagan world the Holy Spirit drops some moral virtues and beams of light, from whence have issued many excellent sayings, some of which the Holy Spirit hath so far owned as to quote them in his own Book: but the Father doth in a special manner love, and the Son did in a special manner die for the elect. Hence proportionably the Holy Spirit works in them after more glorious strains of power and grace: as a Spirit of grace and supplication he melts them into repentance; as a Spirit of faith he makes them catch hold upon Christ for righteousness and life; as a Spirit of wisdom he unveils their hearts, and makes the light to shine out of darkness; as a Spirit of liberty he unshackles and unbinds their wills, and makes them free indeed in the ways of God; and, as a Spirit of truth and holiness he leads them into truth, and by inward law-engravings moulds and changes them into it. Moreover, the Holy Spirit, after such glorious workings on them, comes and dwells in them, and that intimately in the very secrets of their hearts: *I will indwell in them*, saith he, 2 Cor. vi. 16. There are two *ins*, to denote an intimate inhabitation, as if God could never be near enough to them. As in Christ personal, who is the Head, there is God in the flesh, by an hypostatical union; so in Christ mystical, which is the body, there is God in the flesh by a gracious inhabitation; and to shew that he is there, he cries *abba Father* in their devotions: he is a Spirit of love in their charities; a Spirit

of power in their infirmities ; a Spirit of comfort in their distresses ; and a Spirit of glory in their sufferings. Seeing then the Holy Spirit, who works in men more or less according to the Father's love and Son's merits, works in such a special way in the elect, it is as clear as if it were written with a sunbeam, that the Father loves them and the Son died for them in a special way. Hence we find these three folded and wrapt up together by the apostle, " Elect according to the foreknowledge of the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ," 1 Pet. i. 2. And again, " The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all," 2 Cor. xiii. 14. If the Father's love and the Son's blood had respected all men as much as the elect, doubtless the Holy Spirit, who in subsistence proceeds, and in operations works from them both, would have converted all as well as the elect ; why then are not all men actually converted ? Is it because the Holy Spirit works not equally in all, or because the Holy Spirit is resisted in some ? Is it because the Holy Spirit works not equally in all ? I answer, That the Spirit is sent forth from the Father and the Son, and works exactly according as it is sent. The inward impulsive cause of pouring out the Spirit is the Father's love, and the outward meritorious cause of it is the Son's blood : wherefore, if the Father equally love all, and the Son equally died for all, the Spirit works equally in all ; for there can be no breach in the sacred Trinity. Or is it because the Spirit is resisted in some ? I answer, Their resistance is a grand obstacle to the work, but if the Spirit did roll away the stone, and new mould the heart, and work the will in all, as he doth in the elect, that obstacle would at last be removed out of the way.

5. I argue from the blessings purchased. Christ's death is more or less respective of men, as it is more or less procurative of blessings for them. Christ purchased a salvability for all, but over and besides he purchased many choice blessings for the elect. He purchased repentance for them ; for " he is a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel," Acts v. 31. He purchased a room for repentance even for all men ; but he purchased repentance itself for his chosen Israel. He purchased faith for them : " Unto you it is given, for Christ's sake, to believe in him,"

Phil. i. 29. For others he purchased a ground-work for faith, but for them he purchased the very grace of faith: he purchased effectual vocation for them. Others have a call by the gospel, but these have a call by the gospel coming *in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance*: he purchased holiness and sanctification for them. Indeed there is no man living on the earth, but, if he did really believe, he should have "the rivers of living water, the Spirit of holiness flowing in his heart," John vii. 38.; but the elect were destined and "chosen in Christ to be holy," Eph. i. 4.; and Christ sanctified himself in a special manner for them, *that they might be sanctified in truth*, actually and truly, John xvii. 19. Lastly, he purchased heaven and glory for them. Others may have heaven upon believing, but these shall certainly arrive at it: these are *the sheep, to which Christ gives eternal life*, John x. 28.; these are *the sons, which, without fail, shall be brought to glory*, Heb. ii. 10. Now seeing Christ purchased so many blessings for the elect, it is evident he died for them in a special way.

6. I argue from the intercession of Christ. Christ intercedes for men more or less proportionably as he more or less respected them in his death; for his death is the foundation of his intercession: the very same blood of Christ, which as shed on earth made satisfaction, as presented in heaven makes intercession. Now how far doth Christ intercede in heaven? What doth his blood speak there? For all men it speaks thus: Father, let them all be saved on gospel terms. But for the elect it speaks thus: Father, let them have repentance. This the apostle hints out: "Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel," Acts v. 31. Israel's repentance on earth comes from Christ exalted in heaven; for there he intercedes for it by his merits, and from thence he works it by his Spirit. Again, it speaks for them thus: Father, let them be made a willing people. This I gather from Psalm cx., where we find *Christ sitting at the right hand of God*, ver. 1., and sitting there he intercedes for us, and from this session and intercession comes forth *a willing people*, ver. 3. Here is the true original of spiritual willingness; the right hand of God, which is a right hand of power, works it in our hearts, and works it at the instance of Christ, who sits and intercedes there for it.

Again, it speaks for them thus: Father, sanctify them with thy grace, preserve them with thy power, and crown them with thy glory in heaven. Thus Christ, in his sweet prayer, a little before his bitter passion, interceded for them for their sanctification: "Sanctify them through thy truth," John xvii. 17.; for their perseverance, "Keep them through thine own name," ver. 11.; and for their glory, "I will that they be with me where I am, to behold my glory," ver. 24. And what he spake for them by his oral intercession on earth, that he speaks for them by his real intercession in heaven. Thus Christ doth in a special manner intercede for the elect, which proves that he died for them in a special manner; because his intercession is but the presenting of the merits of his death to his Father in heaven.

7. I argue from the event following upon Christ's death. Some men do believe, when others draw back, and whence comes this distinguishing faith? Either it comes merely of man's free will, or of God's free grace. If we say the first, it is the very mire and dirt of Pelagianism; it is to set up free will as an idol to cast lots upon Christ's blood, whether any one person in the world shall be saved thereby or not: if we say the latter, then God and Christ had a special eye upon some above others; for God ordained that Christ should be the grand *Medium* to salvation, and that faith should be the only way to Christ. If, then, he gave Christ for all, and faith but to some, it is because he did in a special way intend their salvation; and consequently Christ, who came to do his Father's will, had in his death a special respect to them.

8. I argue, from the special expressions in Scripture. As the death of Christ is set out there in words of universality, so it is set out there in words of special peculiarity. "Christ died for the elect," Rom. viii. 33, 34.; "died for the children of God scattered abroad," John xi. 52.; "gave himself for the church," Eph. v. 25.; "gave himself for a peculiar people," Tit. ii. 14.; "laid down his life for the sheep," John x. 15.; "sanctified himself for the given ones," John xvii. 9, 19.; "purchased the church with his own blood," Acts xx. 28.; "redeemed a people from among men," Rev. xiv. 4.; "is a Jesus to his own people," Matth. i. 21.; and "a Saviour to his own body," Eph. v. 23. And is there no emphasis of love? are there no

strains of free grace? is there no import of singular respect and affection in all these expressions? We cannot say so without dispiriting the Scripture. Experience itself tells us, that all are not Christ's elect, children, church, peculiar people, sheep, given ones, body, and redeemed ones from among men. Wherefore, when the Scripture saith that he died for these, it imports that he died for them in a peculiar manner. But you will say, These Scriptures speak rather of the application of Christ's death than the imprecation; and though the imprecation be equally for all, yet the application is proper to believers only. I answer, That if those phrases of *dying for the elect or children of God, giving himself for a church or peculiar people, laying down his life for his sheep, purchasing the church with his blood, and sanctifying himself for the given ones*, do not import imprecation, I know not what can import it. You will reply, That these expressions import not imprecation as it is barely and nakedly in itself, but as it hath application following upon it, and this is the emphasis of them. But if these expressions import imprecation with application following upon it, whether doth that application follow upon imprecation as a fruit thereof or not? If so, then Christ merited that application for the elect, and consequently died in a special manner for them; if not, then there is no emphasis of special love and grace in all those expressions of his *dying, giving himself, sanctifying himself, and laying down his life* for them; for there was no merit in all this to procure the application of his death unto them. But let us further inquire what these elect, children, church, peculiar people, sheep, given ones, and redeemed ones from among men were before or without the purchase made by Christ. Were these elect called and justified without Christ or not? If so, why did he die for them? If not, then he died for them that they might be so called and justified. Were these children meritoriously begotten by Christ's blood or not? If so, then that blood did more for them than for others; if not, then they were not the seed of Christ. Was that church an actual church before or without Christ's purchase? or was it a church in his intention? If an actual church, what need he purchase it? If a church in intention, then the special design of his death was to make it an actual church. Was that peculiar people such without the merit of Christ's death or not? If so, why did he

give himself for it? If not, then he gave himself for it that it might be such. Were those sheep brought into Christ's fold without his death or not? If so, why did he lay down his life for them? If not, he laid it down to bring them thither. Were those given ones actually sanctified without the virtue of Christ's sacrifice or not? If so, then why did he sanctify himself for them? If not, then he sanctified himself for them, that they might be sanctified. Were those redeemed from among men redeemed by Christ or not? If so, then he redeemed them in a special manner. If not, then they are the redeemed ones of their own free will. But let the texts themselves breathe forth their own native strains of love and grace. He so died for the elect as to *effectually call and actually justify them*, Rom. viii. 30, 33.; he so died for his children as to *gather them together into one*—one faith on earth, and one fruition in heaven, John xi. 52.; he so gave himself for the church as to *make it a glorious church, without spot or wrinkle*, Eph. v. 25, 27.; he so gave himself for his people as to *make them his peculiar ones*, Tit. ii. 14.; he so laid down his life for his sheep as to *bring them into his fold, and make them hear his voice*, Jolm x. 15, 16.; he so sanctified himself for the given ones as to *sanctify them through the truth*, John xvii. 19.; he so redeemed his chosen ones from among men as to *make them first fruits to God and the Lamb*, Rev. xiv. 4. In all these special Scriptures it evidently appears, that Christ in his death had a special respect to his elect. Wherefore I will shut up all with that of an ancient: *Etsi Christus pro omnibus mortuus est, pro nobis tamen specialiter passus est, quia pro ecclesia passus est.*—Although Christ died for all, he yet suffered specially for us, because he suffered for the church.

THE END.







**PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET**

---

---

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY**

---

---

**BRIEF**

*BV*

**0055893**

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW



D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C  
39 09 05 07 02 002 8